

CHECKPOINT OF THE FUTURE: EVALUATING TSA'S INNOVATION TASK FORCE INITIATIVE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND PROTECTIVE SECURITY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 27, 2017

Serial No. 115-14

Printed for the use of the Committee on Homeland Security



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

27-292 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2017

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas, *Chairman*

LAMAR SMITH, Texas	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
PETER T. KING, New York	SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina	CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania	DONALD M. PAYNE, JR., New Jersey
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	FILEMON VELA, Texas
JOHN KATKO, New York	BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, New Jersey
WILL HURD, Texas	KATHLEEN M. RICE, New York
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona	J. LUIS CORREA, California
JOHN RATCLIFFE, Texas	VAL BUTLER DEMINGS, Florida
DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR., New York	NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN, California
MIKE GALLAGHER, Wisconsin	
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	
JOHN H. RUTHERFORD, Florida	
THOMAS A. GARRETT, JR., Virginia	
BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania	

BRENDAN P. SHIELDS, *Staff Director*
KATHLEEN CROOKS FLYNN, *Deputy General Counsel*
MICHAEL S. TWINCHEK, *Chief Clerk*
HOPE GOINS, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND PROTECTIVE SECURITY

JOHN KATKO, New York, *Chairman*

PETER T. KING, New York	BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, New Jersey
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	DONALD M. PAYNE, JR., New Jersey
BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (<i>ex officio</i>)
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas (<i>ex officio</i>)	

KRISTA P. HARVEY, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
CEDRIC C. HAYNES, *Minority Subcommittee Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS	
The Honorable John Katko, a Representative in Congress From the State of New York, and Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security:	
Oral Statement	1
Prepared Statement	3
The Honorable Bonnie Watson Coleman, a Representative in Congress From the State of New Jersey, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security:	
Oral Statement	4
The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson, a Representative in Congress From the State of Mississippi, and Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security:	
Prepared Statement	5
WITNESSES	
Mr. Steve Karoly, Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Requirements and Capabilities Analysis, Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Department of Homeland Security:	
Oral Statement	6
Prepared Statement	8
Mr. Roosevelt Council Jr., General Manager, Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport, Department of Aviation, City of Atlanta, Georgia:	
Oral Statement	11
Prepared Statement	14
Ms. Jeanne M. Olivier, A.A.E., Assistant Director, Aviation Security and Technology, Security Operations and Programs Department, The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey:	
Oral Statement	16
Prepared Statement	17
APPENDIX	
Questions From Chairman John Katko for Steve Karoly	35
Questions From Ranking Member Watson Coleman for Steve Karoly	36
Questions From Chairman John Katko for Roosevelt Council, Jr.	37
Questions From Chairman Michael T. McCaul for Jeanne M. Olivier	38

CHECKPOINT OF THE FUTURE: EVALUATING TSA'S INNOVATION TASK FORCE INITIATIVE

Thursday, April 27, 2017

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
PROTECTIVE SECURITY,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:32 p.m., in room HVC-210, Capitol Visitors Center, Hon. John Katko (Chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Katko, Rogers, Higgins, Fitzpatrick, Watson Coleman, and Payne.

Mr. KATKO. The Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security will come to order.

Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge a couple of distinguished guests here today: Mr. Costello Coleman and Mr. Anthony Devone. Both of them are students from Friendship Collegiate Academy here in the District of Columbia, and one of them I am trying to get to go to Syracuse University, so we will have to see how that goes.

The subcommittee is meeting today to examine the implementation of the Transportation Security Administration's Administrative Task Force initiative. In addition to TSA, we will also hear from airport stakeholders that have partnered with the task force.

I now recognize myself for an opening statement.

I would like to welcome everyone to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security's hearing to examine the state of TSA's Innovative Task Force initiative. Many of us here are all too familiar with the struggles TSA has faced over its 15-year history to field cutting-edge technology and security solutions in a timely manner to meet the ever-evolving threat landscape.

A year ago, then-Administrator Neffenger launched the Innovative Task Force initiative in an effort to inculcate a culture of innovation into how the organization thinks about meeting the challenges of current and evolving threats. I commend the former administrator for starting this critical effort, and I support the important mission of this initiative.

However, it is the committee's job to make sure that the task force is meeting its stated goals and has the resources it needs. With effective oversight we can all work together to ensure that the positive momentum created by the Innovative Task Force initiative, or ITF, continues and that the lessons learned are not con-

fined to a vacuum, but instead both support and inform the broader mission and goals of the TSA as a whole.

What is most important is that TSA leverages the work of this initiative to guarantee to the American people that future procurement decisions are a sound investment of taxpayer dollars and that the technology TSA procures is capable of detecting the latest threat.

While the Federal Government is ultimately responsible for delivering on the secure freedom of movement throughout the Nation's transportation systems, the effectiveness of the security framework surrounding that movement hinges on the private sector's commitment to innovation and continuous development of the new security technologies to screen millions of passengers and bags every day.

However, quality innovation comes with a hefty price tag, and we cannot reasonably expect the private sector to spend millions of dollars in the research and development of new and emerging technologies without greater transparency and communication from both TSA and the Department of Homeland Security.

Currently, TSA is focusing on deploying automated screening lanes across 21 of the Nation's largest airports. Automated screening lanes should help reduce passenger queues at the checkpoint.

As we have seen with recent attacks around the world, terrorists are increasingly targeting public spaces with large crowds of people to inflict the maximum number of casualties, and anything we can do to reduce that target is a good thing. Thus, the automated screening lanes can serve to enhance the passenger experience, ease the burden on TSOs, and eliminate security vulnerabilities.

When thinking about how to build the checkpoint of the future, TSA should strive to meet all of these goals when acquiring new technology and proposing new solutions. However, to accomplish this we need to reach far beyond automated screening lanes.

This is why I am pleased that the ITF has plans to pilot C.T. X-rays at passenger checkpoints and venture into biometric authentication technology and innovations in passenger communication all before the end of the summer travel season. That is a laudable goal.

I am also optimistic about TSA's efforts to connect industry with airport operators across the country to facilitate innovation in other aspects of transportation security outside the checkpoint, such as employee screening and biometric bag drop. However, we can and should be doing more.

All of these demonstrations and pilots will be wasted if they fail to inform the administration's Strategic Five-Year Technology Investment Plan or enhance TSA's somewhat troubled procurement process. I hope when the next administrator is appointed he or she will continue to build on the progress of the task force and better integrate its work across TSA and DHS as a whole to leverage its successes.

I believe that we are behind the curve concerning our technology innovation, particularly with respect to what is going on in Europe in some places, and the traveler experience at our Nation's airports. Many foreign airports have implemented improved security scanners, better biometric capabilities, and smarter systems for

passenger queuing to meet the emerging threats in a timely manner.

I look forward to hearing the perspectives of our witnesses on how TSA and its industry partners are working together to bring more innovative solutions to transportation security and what more needs to be done to meet this goal. I encourage all of the witnesses today to be candid about how the scope of this initiative can be expanded.

It is not often when we ask these questions that we are going to today: What else could you use to make your job better? We are going—we are going to be asking questions like that because we want to know. We want to know how DHS and TSA can better support this task force.

With that, I am pleased to recognize the Ranking Member of the subcommittee, my friend and the gentlelady from New Jersey, Mrs. Bonnie Watson Coleman, for her opening statement.

[The statement of Chairman Katko follows:]

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JOHN KATKO

APRIL 27, 2017

I would like to welcome everyone to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security's hearing to examine the state of TSA's Innovation Task Force initiative. Many of us here are all too familiar with the struggles TSA has faced over its 15-year history to field cutting-edge technology and security solutions to meet the ever-evolving threat landscape.

A year ago, then-Administrator Neffenger launched the Innovation Task Force initiative in an effort to inculcate a culture of innovation into how the organization thinks about meeting the challenges of current and evolving threats. I commend the former administrator for starting this critical effort, and I support the important mission of this initiative.

However, it is this committee's job to make sure that this task force is meeting its stated goals, and has the resources it needs. With effective oversight, we can all work together to ensure that the positive momentum created by the Innovation Task Force initiative continues and that the lessons learned are not confined to a vacuum, but instead both support and inform the broader mission and goals of TSA as a whole. What is most important is that TSA leverages the work of this initiative to guarantee to the American people that future procurement decisions are a sound investment of taxpayer dollars and that the technology TSA procures is capable of detecting the latest threat.

While the Federal Government is ultimately responsible for delivering on the secure freedom of movement throughout the Nation's transportation systems, the effectiveness of the security framework surrounding that movement hinges on the private sector's commitment to innovation and continuous development of new security technologies to screen millions of passengers and bags every day.

However, quality innovation comes with a hefty price tag, and we cannot reasonably expect the private sector to spend millions of dollars in the research and development of new and emerging technologies without greater transparency and communication from both TSA and the Department of Homeland Security.

Currently, TSA is focusing on deploying Automated Screening Lanes, across 21 of the Nation's largest airports. Automated Screening Lanes should help to reduce passenger queues at the checkpoint. As we have seen with recent attacks around the world, terrorists are increasingly targeting public spaces with large crowds of people to inflict the maximum number of casualties.

Thus, the Automated Screening Lanes can serve to enhance the passenger experience, ease the burden on TSOs, and eliminate security vulnerabilities. When thinking about how to build the checkpoint of the future, TSA should strive to meet all three of these goals when acquiring new technology and proposing new solutions.

However, to accomplish this we need to reach far beyond Automated Screening Lanes. This is why I am pleased that the ITF has plans to pilot CT X-rays at passenger checkpoints, biometric authentication technology, and innovations in passenger communication all before the end of the summer travel season.

I am also optimistic about TSA's efforts to connect industry with airport operators across the country to facilitate innovation in other aspects of transportation security outside the checkpoint—such as employee screening and biometric bag drop. However, we can and should be doing more.

All of these demonstrations and pilots will be wasted effort if they fail to inform the administration's Strategic Five-Year Technology Investment Plan or enhance TSA's broken procurement process. I hope when the next administrator is appointed, he or she will continue to build on the progress of this task force, and better integrate its work across TSA and DHS as a whole to leverage its successes.

I believe that we are behind the curve concerning our technology innovation and the traveler experience at our Nation's airports. Many foreign airports have implemented improved security scanners, better biometric capabilities, and smarter systems for passenger queuing to meet the emerging threats of today.

I look forward to hearing the perspectives of our witnesses on how TSA and its industry partners are working together to bring more innovative solutions to transportation security, and what more needs to be done to meet this goal.

I encourage all of the witnesses today to be candid about how the scope of this initiative can be expanded, and how DHS and TSA can better support this task force.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I want to thank the witnesses for being here today. I am particularly excited to see Ms. Olivier here, who is representing the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, and to discuss the progress that has been made at the Newark Airport and is soon to be made at JFK Airport at improving passenger screening.

It was a pleasure to meet with Mr. Karoly and Mr. Council as we prepared for this meeting today.

I, along with millions of people, rely on the Port Authority services, and I am especially pleased that you are here as a leader in transforming passenger screening services. TSA's role in protecting passengers comes with a unique set of challenges.

Among these challenges is responding to the ever-evolving threat environment where terrorist groups innovate when it comes to bomb-making. This homeland security issue demands that TSA not only assess whether its current security protocols can detect such threats, but also act swiftly to identify, test, and put in place technologies and processes to address such threats.

TSA is charged with carrying out this critical homeland security responsibility in an environment that often does not come with long-term fiscal planning resources. When TSA launched the Innovation Task Force in 2016 I was pleased to see TSA embrace direct collaboration with aviation security stakeholders in a more formal dialog to help drive the movement of the best ideas from paper to the airport checkpoint.

Since that time, aviation security stakeholders have provided a range of feedback about the task force, but all agreed that it has been a helpful forum for their efforts to innovate passenger security screening. Though the impact of the task force is limited today, with the demonstrations underway at a handful of airports, it seems well-positioned to make great strides in improving passenger security screening, and I applaud all involved for their efforts.

Currently, there are 48 automated screening lanes in operation around the country, with 17 of those in Newark Liberty International and 19 in Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport. I am pleased that in the coming months TSA plans to put more automated screening lanes in more airports around the coun-

try and that at the same time TSA is pursuing complementary initiatives such as demonstrations of biometric authentication technology, also known as BAT, and computed tomography.

The Transportation Security Administration's Innovation Task Force is a great platform for TSA to support and engage with stakeholders committed to innovating the passenger screening service. Going forward, TSA needs to be more strategic and transparent about investments in innovation and allocate adequate resources for such effort.

For instance, it would be good to know how the task force initiatives line up with TSA's Five-Year Technology Investment Plan. To date, much of the cost of the development technology for the demonstrations has been borne by the private-sector stakeholders, as was stated by the Chairman; and it will be important to know if going forward TSA plans to make investments in technologies that it develops through the task force.

I look forward to hearing today how Congress can be more helpful in ensuring that the task force's efforts can be sustained and improved to deliver more effective and efficient passenger screening experience to the flying public.

Once again, I thank you all for being here and for sharing your testimony with us.

I yield back the balance of my time to the Chairman.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you, Mrs. Watson Coleman.

Other Members of the committee are reminded that opening statements may be submitted for the record.

[The statement of Ranking Member Thompson follows:]

STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER BENNIE G. THOMPSON

APRIL 27, 2017

In March 2016, TSA launched the Innovation Task Force as a platform for collaboration between TSA, airports, air carriers, and security technology stakeholders in furtherance of the development and integration of innovative security capabilities into our Nation's airports.

Since the launch of the Task Force, we have heard from stakeholders about the progress that has been made in passenger screening. As a result of Task Force efforts, there are a number of technology demonstrations in the cue to be rolled out in the airport environment. These innovative systems are geared at making TSA's security screening more efficient and effective.

In preparation for this hearing, one thing has become apparent to me—the private sector has provided a great deal of leadership in passenger screening initiatives. I applaud the efforts of the airlines, the airports, vendors who have overwhelmingly embraced this opportunity to improve passengers' screening experience, while enhancing airport security.

It has also become clear to me that this Task Force was something that was needed for a very long time and I applaud former—TSA administrator John Neffenger for recognizing the need and putting this initiative in place.

I also want to recognize Dr. Huban Gowadia who—since January, has overseen TSA in an acting capacity and has shown great commitment to the Task Force. It is troubling that we are nearly 100 days into the Trump administration and, as with so many other critical positions, the President has failed to nominate a TSA administrator.

Turning back to the subject at hand, I look forward to learning more about how the Task Force has been functioning, how stakeholders have been able to build upon their working relationships with TSA and each other to move forward with innovative passenger screening technologies as well as how Congress can support these efforts.

I look forward to hearing today about ways Congress can be a partner in helping the Innovation Task Force achieve its goals.

Mr. KATKO. We are very pleased to have a distinguished panel here to testify before us today on this very important topic.

Our first witness, Mr. Steve Karoly, has never testified before Congress, and I know how excited he is to do so, right?

Mr. KAROLY. Absolutely.

Mr. KATKO. He serves as the acting assistant administrator for TSA's Office of Requirements and Capabilities Analysis.

Thank you for being here, sir.

Mr. Karoly has been with TSA since 2014, prior to which he served almost 30 years as a captain in the U.S. Navy and Naval Reserve.

We thank you for your on-going service to our country.

I would also like to recognize Mr. Karoly's daughter, Olivia—stand up, Olivia; say hello, all right—who is in the audience today. She is in the eighth grade and accompanying her father for Bring Your Children to Work Day at TSA.

Now, this is a pretty interesting day to come to work with your dad. Maybe one day I will be introducing Olivia to testify before the committee herself.

Our second witness, Mr. Roosevelt Council, Jr., who was named the general manager of Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport in January 2017. Prior to this role, Mr. Council served as deputy general manager and chief financial officer for the airport.

He is a graduate of Memphis State University, the Harvard Executive Leadership Program, and the Georgia Leadership Council. I have spoken with Mr. Council before and he is truly an impressive gentleman.

Our third witness is Ms. Jeanne Olivier, the assistant director for aviation security and technology at the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. Ms. Olivier has worked with the Port Authority for over 30 years and airport operational management positions at JFK International, LaGuardia, Newark Liberty International, and Teterboro Airports. She has managed the Central Aviation Security Program since the attacks on the World Trade Center in 2001, including oversight of security and technology for the Port Authority's five airports.

I would like to thank all of you for being here today, and I look forward to your testimony.

I now recognize Mr. Steve Karoly for his opening statement.

STATEMENT OF STEVE KAROLY, ACTING ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES ANALYSIS, TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. KAROLY. Thank you, Chairman Katko.

Good afternoon, Chairman Katko, Ranking Member Watson Coleman, and distinguished Members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the Transportation Security Administration's Innovation Task Force, or ITF, and its role in fulfilling our mission to protect the Nation's transportation systems to ensure freedom of movement for people and commerce. It is truly an honor and privilege to be here.

Chairman Katko, I thank you for recognizing my daughter. Although this is my first time to testify, I am probably more concerned about what she thinks at the end of this.

I appreciate——

Mr. KATKO. She is a teenager, so don't get too optimistic.

Mr. KAROLY. I appreciate the committee's interest in and support of this initiative, including visits by you and your staff to the TSA Systems Integration Facility and airports deploying ITF technologies, as well as language enacted last year directing TSA to pursue innovative technology solutions. I also appreciate the collaboration of our airport, air carrier, and industry partners, including my colleagues here today, to demonstrate emerging technologies at our Nation's airports.

TSA is taking a transformative new approach to technology with the Innovation Task Force. The ITF allows vendors to gather live stream-of-commerce data in the field in order to inform and refine their technology prior to entering the formal acquisition process. This ensures that better product enters formal testing while allowing TSA to gain immediate benefits.

TSA laid out a plan to improve our technology capabilities in the Strategic Five-Year Technology Investment Plan for Aviation Security. This plan acknowledges the challenges in integrating new technologies into the operational environment prior to formal field testing and makes the commitment to increase stakeholder access to the operating environments. This laid the foundation for the Innovation Task Force, which TSA stood up in the spring of 2016.

In 9 short weeks we were able to deploy our first innovative solution, the automated screening lanes, or ASLs, at Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport, in partnership with Delta Air Lines and with the support of our Atlanta Airport partners. These ASLs augment existing X-ray screening technology for carry-on baggage and include multiple divestiture stations, enhanced bin tracking and data capabilities, and automated bin returns.

Taking into account recent terror attacks on public airport areas, ASLs help TSA address concerns regarding crowding in public areas. In September 2016 the Department of Homeland Security approved an urgent operational need justification authorizing the deployment of up to 220 ASLs at 21 specified airports by January 31, 2018. This deployment is, of course, dependent upon TSA's establishing partnerships with stakeholders for additional lane deployments.

Following the demonstrated success in Atlanta and DHS approval, TSA partnered with additional airlines and airports to deploy ASLs. Today we have 51 ASLs in operation at four airports across the country.

Two of our largest ASL deployments include 22 lanes at Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport and 17 lanes at Newark Liberty International Airport. Our most recent deployment was three lanes in Atlanta, which went live yesterday.

Additional ASLs are operational at Los Angeles and Chicago O'Hare International Airports.

While ASLs were our first ITF demonstration to be deployed, they will not be our last. Future ITF technologies include using

computed tomography at the checkpoint, traditionally a technology used for checked baggage, to improve carry-on baggage detection.

ITF's biometric authentication technology, or BAT, proof of concept uses fingerprint scanning to verify TSA PreCheck passenger identities. Eventually, BAT could automate the ticket document checker process by electronically verifying passenger identity and secure flight status.

Additionally, in an effort to improve our understanding of existing market capabilities, TSA issued its first innovation-related broad agency announcement in May 2016. We received 81 responses and completed over 200 technical reviews; 52 percent of those solutions submitted had not been previously deployed domestically or internationally.

TSA selected eight of these technologies to potentially join the portfolio of ITF solutions, and planning activities for these demonstrations are underway.

TSA plans to release the second innovation-related BAA in May 2017.

To be clear, the ITF does not provide a shortcut around traditional acquisition processes. While data gathered from ITF demonstrations may be used to inform manufacturers in the design and preparation of their prototype units for testing at DHS and TSA, these technologies still need to go through the rigors of the acquisition process before becoming a program of record.

I would like to conclude by offering you all the opportunity to visit the TSA Systems Integration Facility, located nearby Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, to see first-hand these ITF technologies in action. I would also like to thank the subcommittee for its continued support of the ITF and our airport, airline, and industry partners whose support make this endeavor possible.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today. I look forward to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Karoly follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STEVE KAROLY

APRIL 27, 2017

Good morning, Chairman Katko, Ranking Member Watson Coleman, and distinguished Members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) Innovation Task Force (ITF) and its role in fulfilling our mission to protect the Nation's transportation systems to ensure freedom of movement for people and commerce. I appreciate the committee's interest in and support of this initiative as we work with our airport, air carrier, and other industry partners to demonstrate emerging technologies at our Nation's airports.

BACKGROUND

TSA prioritizes its technology investments based on the latest intelligence concerning terrorist capabilities and intent. This is accomplished by performing risk analyses which serve as the foundation for deriving operational needs and requirements. These analyses take into consideration potential threats, vulnerabilities to those threats given current system capabilities, and the consequences in the event of an attack. To meet the challenges posed by these risk factors, TSA and industry partners must continually adapt and evolve screening technologies, processes, and systems.

TSA laid out a plan to improve our technology capabilities in the *Strategic Five-Year Technology Investment Plan for Aviation Security* (the Plan), mandated under the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act (Pub. L. 113-245). In the Plan,

initially released in August 2015, TSA laid the foundation for what would become the ITF. One of TSA's five focus areas in the Plan includes "Increasing Transparency in Engagement with Stakeholders to Enable Innovation." The Plan acknowledges that one of the difficulties with the development and integration of new capabilities is the integration of these capabilities into TSA's operational environment, given the difficulties of simulating the operational environment prior to formal testing in the field. In addition, the Plan provides a commitment to increase stakeholder access to the operating environments these capabilities are designed to improve or enhance. To deliver on this commitment, TSA established the ITF in the spring of 2016.

TSA launched the ITF to demonstrate emerging capabilities in the passenger screening checkpoint and the checked baggage screening areas and charged the agency to re-envision the entire transportation security system as an integrated whole; increasing security effectiveness, while reducing friction to the traveler. ITF accomplishes this through the establishment of innovation sites. An innovation site is a designated airport where TSA is actively partnering with the airport authority and/or air carrier(s) to demonstrate one or more prototype technology, process, or staffing solutions. The ITF has led to the deployment of Automated Screening Lanes (ASLs) and is planning new projects ranging from aesthetic improvements to new detection technologies.

SITE SELECTION PROCESS

TSA selects innovation sites based on several criteria to ensure TSA resources are utilized efficiently, and in compliance with the requirements of the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016 (Pub. L. 114–190). Under our current methodology, TSA selects Category X airports where it will establish innovation sites based on the following site-selection criteria:

- Ability to begin the reconfiguration and installation of security systems expeditiously;
- Ability to share costs through Federal funding, airport funding, or otherwise;
- Infrastructure, and space needed to reduce vulnerabilities and reconfigure existing security systems, and not negatively impact current screening capacity;
- Impact to security effectiveness and efficiency, including consideration of detection capabilities; and
- Ability of operational staff and stakeholders to support the initiative.

Sites are continually assessed and may be rotated to minimize resource impacts and secure a representative sample of the field environment.

AUTOMATED SCREENING LANES

ITF's first innovation solution was Automated Screening Lanes (ASLs) demonstrated at Atlanta-Hartsfield Jackson Airport (ATL). In less than 9 weeks, the ITF established ATL as an innovation site and demonstrated ASLs in partnership with Delta Air Lines. ASLs augment existing X-ray screening technology for carry-on baggage and include multiple divestiture stations, enhanced bin tracking and data capabilities, and automated bin returns. TSA, airports, airlines, vendors, and travelers have recognized ASLs as ground-breaking in advancing security effectiveness, increasing throughput, and improving the passenger experience.

Taking into account the recent terror attacks on public airport areas that took place at Brussels, Los Angeles, and Fort Lauderdale, ASLs provide TSA the capability to address long-held concerns regarding crowding in the public areas. ASLs assist in the security of public areas by increasing checkpoint throughput and reducing the number of individuals waiting in line. In September 2016, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) approved an Urgent Operational Need (UON) justification which authorizes the deployment of up to 220 ASLs at 21 specified airports by January 31, 2018. While the UON authorizes 220 ASLs, deployment at this scale is contingent upon TSA establishing partnerships with stakeholders for additional lane deployments.

After the demonstrated success of the ASLs in Atlanta and after the DHS approval of the UON, TSA partnered with additional airlines and airports to deploy the capability at 25 lanes at 4 airports by the close of calendar year 2016. Since the start of 2017, we have deployed 23 additional ASLs at these airports, bringing the total to 48. TSA and our partners deployed 17 of these lanes earlier this month at Newark Liberty International Airport in what was our largest single ASL deployment to date. In addition to Atlanta-Hartsfield and Newark, ASLs are operational at, Los Angeles, and Chicago-O'Hare International Airports. These efforts are paying measurable dividends in effectiveness, efficiency, and even employee morale.

OTHER ITF TECHNOLOGIES

While ASLs were the ITF's first demonstrated technology solution, they are not our only planned demonstration. The ITF continues to expand to explore new solutions through temporary demonstrations at airports Nation-wide.

One such new technology involves utilization of computed tomography (CT) to screen carry-on baggage and accessible property. CT, a mainstay for checked baggage screening, utilizes 3D-imaging and detection software to help operators automatically identify threats and may eliminate the need for divestiture of electronics and liquids for passenger accessible property screening. The demonstration for CT is planned for June of this year at Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport.

ITF's Biometric Authentication Technology (BAT) proof of concept unit uses contact or contactless fingerprint scanning to verify TSA PreCheck® passenger identity. In the long term, BAT could automate the Ticket Document Checker (TDC) process by verifying passenger identity and Secure Flight vetting status, eliminating the need for a boarding pass, and grant or deny access to passengers via an electronic gate to the security checkpoint. The proof of concept will compare the passenger's fingerprint to the fingerprint the passenger provided to TSA during TSA PreCheck® enrollment. BAT will be demonstrated initially at Denver International Airport and Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport for proof of concept testing before the end of the fiscal year.

Additionally, ITF's Passenger Communications initiative streamlines checkpoint operations by presenting passengers with an avatar discussing various procedures such as divesting of carry-on property. TSA is working with airports and terminal operators to demonstrate a variety of passenger communication tools and techniques and provide data for future checkpoint enhancements and designs. TSA plans to demonstrate Passenger Communications by July 2017 at Atlanta-Hartsfield and Newark.

In an effort to improve our understanding of existing market capabilities, TSA issued a Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) in July 2016 following a June 2016 industry day. TSA received 81 responses and completed over 200 technical reviews with over 30 reviewers from across TSA and the DHS enterprise. Fifty-two percent of the solutions submitted had not been previously deployed domestically or internationally. TSA selected eight of these technologies to potentially join the portfolio of ITF solutions, and referred two solutions to airports for further consideration. Planning activities for these eight technologies are under way. Additionally, TSA plans to release the second innovation-related BAA in May 2017 highlighting specific areas of interest to include mobile screening, queuing and passenger flow, and new detection capabilities.

To be clear, the ITF does not provide a shortcut around traditional DHS acquisition processes. While data gathered from ITF demonstrations may be used to inform manufacturers in the design and preparation of their prototype units for testing at the DHS Transportation Security Laboratory and TSA Systems Integration Facility (TSIF), as well as to inform TSA in developing future technology requirements, technologies that are ITF solutions which involve passenger safety and security still need to go through appropriate rigorous testing at these respective facilities as required under standard acquisition processes before becoming a program of record. These processes ensure that before fully investing in a technology, we know it will enhance transportation security, reduce the risk to the traveling public, and function properly in an operational environment.

CONCLUSION

The ITF is focused on taking a fresh look at the entire aviation security system. We are working with public and private partners to provide a platform for Government, industry, and stakeholders to gather requirements for new approaches to transportation security and accelerate the development and deployment of new technologies and improvements to operations.

I would like to conclude by offering you all the opportunity to visit the TSIF, located nearby at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, to see these ITF technologies in action first-hand. I would also like to thank the subcommittee for its continued support of the ITF, and our airline and airport partners whose support makes this endeavor possible. Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you, Mr. Karoly. Your first time testifying and you got within 8 seconds of the time limit. That is pretty darn good, so I thank you.

I now recognize Mr. Roosevelt Council for his testimony.

STATEMENT OF ROOSEVELT COUNCIL JR., GENERAL MANAGER, HARTSFIELD-JACKSON ATLANTA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION, CITY OF ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Mr. COUNCIL. Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman Katko, Ranking Member Watson Coleman, and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for holding this hearing, and let me express my sincerest gratitude for once again including Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport in your discussions.

So as you are well aware, Hartsfield-Jackson is the world's busiest airport. In 2015 we became the first airport ever to host more than 100 million passengers in a single year; and in 2016 we welcomed even more, topping 104 million passengers.

So to provide some perspective, that is more than 280,000 passengers, on average, that navigates themselves through our airport each and every day. In 2016 more than 17 million passengers underwent TSA screening at our airport, so that is nearly about 47,000 daily passengers on average going through security screening each day.

Stories of long security lines made National headlines in 2015 and 2016. At Hartsfield-Jackson wait times exceeding 35 minutes were not uncommon during this time period.

To ease congestion while keeping safety and security at the forefront, we worked with TSA and the airlines to ramp up staffing, open lanes earlier in the day, and increase the use of canine teams. In addition, we introduced automated screening lanes, commonly known as smart lanes, which is the subject of today's hearing.

Hartsfield-Jackson was the first airport in the Nation to test these smart lanes as part of a pilot program in which we partnered with Delta Air Lines, the Transportation Security Administration, and the city of Atlanta. These smart lanes are modeled after a system used at London's Heathrow Airport.

Construction on two smart lanes began May 4, 2016 at our south security checkpoint in our domestic terminal. Both were fully operational by May 26.

So for Hartsfield-Jackson smart lanes supported three primary objectives.

The first objective was to strengthen security. Smart lanes have a dual exit belt from the X-ray machine. If a bag sets off an alarm it is diverted to an alternate belt for inspection. The owner of the bag does not have access to the diverted bag.

The second objective was to increase operational efficiencies. Smart lanes reduce passenger wait time. Plus, the technology, particularly the automated bin return, eases the manual work performed by TSA agents, who traditionally shuffle bins to the front of the line throughout the day. In addition, these lanes allow up to five people to divest for screening at the same time, which is more efficient than the single-file queues at most screening checkpoints.

The third objective was to improve the passenger experience. The smart lanes' five individual stations enable passengers to place items in the bins at their own pace. In effect, this set-up keeps slower passengers from holding up the line. Plus, the bins use a

tracking system so passengers do not have to wait to go through the body scanners at the same time as their bags. After passengers pick up their bags the bins automatically return to the start of the line.

As I said, we opened our first two smart lanes in the spring of 2016. From our initial observation, those lanes proved successful, safely and efficiently increasing passenger throughput by as much as 30 percent.

This is an important stat when you are talking about reducing wait time and eliminating bottlenecks. A standard security lane can screen, on average, 160 passengers per hour; a smart lane can screen, on average, 208 passengers per hour. During busy travel periods like the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, such expedited screening can make the difference between a 30-minute–35-minute wait time and an under-20-minute wait, which is Hartsfield-Jackson’s overall goal for security screening.

Based on the success of these two pilot smart lanes, we decided to move forward with purchasing additional smart lanes to install in our domestic terminal. It is important to mention that in our domestic terminal we have three security checkpoints: Domestic south, with four lanes; domestic north, with five lanes; and domestic main, with 18 lanes. So that is a total of 27 security lanes.

Beyond the existing smart—two existing smart lanes, our goal was to add 20 more, converting the majority of the standard lanes. That would bring us to 22 smart lanes out of 27 security lanes total. The north checkpoint would have four smart lanes, south would have three, and the main would have 15.

Our initial two smart lanes were funded by a \$1 million investment from Delta Air Lines. Hartsfield-Jackson purchased the additional 20 lanes with airport dollars. That expenditure totaled \$12.5 million.

I should also point out that for the most part U.S. airports are not funding these smart lanes themselves, but relying on airlines to foot most of the bill. However, given the vast amount of O&D traffic at Hartsfield-Jackson, combined with the efficiency from the pilot smart lanes, we saw advantages early on and, of course, we were encouraged by Delta’s initial investment.

Over the past year we have phased in the installation of 20 smart lanes to minimize operational disruption to our passenger and maintain overall screening capacity. We contracted with equipment-provider MacDonald Douglas and we worked with the company to make adjustment to our checkpoints to accommodate the smart lanes.

Smart lanes are roughly 52 feet long. I am sorry, standard lanes are roughly 52 feet long. Smart lanes require an additional 25 feet of space. So there is a sizable footprint to this equipment.

So we began the electrical work in October 2016, and in November we installed one lane at the domestic south, and in December we installed two lanes at the domestic north. Starting in January we staggered the installation of 15 smart lanes at domestic main and two additional lanes at domestic south.

So we set a deadline of May of this year to complete installation of the 20 smart lanes, and we found out last night that all lanes

are now completed and they have been certified by TSA and is now actually in use as of today.

Of course, we were mindful of how the installation would impact our customers, so each phase took into consideration several things: First, that our PreCheck lanes would flex to ensure that at a minimum four lanes remained open throughout the construction time line; second, we made sure all lanes not under construction could be staffed if needed.

So now that all 22 lanes have been installed, I want to offer a few observations.

First, it is clear that smart lanes speed passenger processing. We have seen that in action.

But I should mentioned two important caveats. First, these smart lanes have been with us just shy of 1 year, so their performance over time will be the true measure of success. But based on initial findings, we are pleased with the results.

The second caveat is that a learning curve exists for passengers who are unfamiliar with the technology. However, we are confident that in time people will understand the process and enjoy the convenience and time savings.

The second observation is that it is clear that automation benefits both TSA and the airport. The automated bin system has relieved TSA agents of manual work involving the bins, but the smart lanes themselves have also provided security enhancements. If a suspicious bag is detected it is kept secured from passengers without holding up the line.

The final observation is that clear lanes may help propel our airport's long-term growth. As I mentioned earlier, this airport welcomed 104 million passengers in 2016. That is a 2.6 percent increase over 2015, and we expect our passenger count to continue to climb this year and beyond.

So these smart lanes, combined with the renovation, modernization, and expansion of our facilities as part of our 20-year capital improvement program, will prove useful as we grow our operations to meet passenger demand well into the future.

Now, I should also mention that while Hartsfield-Jackson has been the pioneer on testing smart lanes, as earlier mentioned, other airports have also jumped on board. Hartsfield-Jackson's pioneering efforts are due in no large part to strong working relationships we have cultivated over the years with our stakeholders, particularly TSA.

I want to express our team's gratitude to Atlanta's TSA Federal Security Director Mary Leftridge Byrd for the remarkable job she and her team do each day to ensure passenger safety and security while trying to achieve exemplary customer service. The world's busiest airport appreciates its cohesive and respectful relationship with TSA in order to achieve these successful operations on a daily basis.

So in closing, while it is too early to fully assess the strength and weaknesses of smart lanes, our findings over the past year have shown positive results when it comes to enhancing safety, accelerating passenger processing, increasing operational efficiency, and improving the customer experience.

So once again, I would like to thank this body for the opportunity to address this very important issue at this time. Thank you.
[The statement of Mr. Council follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROOSEVELT COUNCIL, JR.

APRIL 27, 2017

Chairman Katko, Ranking Member Watson Coleman, and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for holding this hearing. And let me express my sincerest gratitude for once again including Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport in your discussions.

As you are well aware, Hartsfield-Jackson is the world's busiest airport. In 2015, we became the first airport ever to host more than 100 million passengers in a single year. And in 2016, we welcomed even more, topping 104 million passengers. To provide some perspective, that's more than 280,000 passengers, on average, navigating through the airport each and every day.

In 2016, more than 17 million passengers underwent TSA security screening at our airport. That's nearly 47,000 daily passengers, on average, going through security screening each day.

Stories of long security lines made National headlines in 2015 and 2016. At Hartsfield-Jackson, wait times exceeding 35 minutes were not uncommon during this time period. To ease congestion while keeping safety and security at the forefront, we worked with TSA and the airlines to ramp up staffing, open lanes earlier in the day and increase the use of K-9 teams.

In addition, we introduced Automated Screening Lanes, commonly known as Smart Lanes, which is the subject of today's hearing.

Hartsfield-Jackson was the first airport in the Nation to test these Smart Lanes as part of a pilot program in which we partnered with Delta Air Lines, the Transportation Security Administration and the city of Atlanta. These Smart Lanes are modeled after a system used at London Heathrow Airport.

Construction on two Smart Lanes began May 4, 2016, at our South Security checkpoint in our Domestic Terminal. Both were fully operational by May 26.

For Hartsfield-Jackson, Smart Lanes supported three primary objectives:

- *The first objective: to strengthen security.*—Smart Lanes have a dual exit belt from the X-ray machine. If a bag sets off an alarm, it is diverted to an alternate belt for inspection. The owner of the bag does not have access to the diverted bag.
- *The second objective: to increase operational efficiencies.*—Smart Lanes reduce passenger wait times. Plus, the technology, particularly the automatic bin return, eases the manual work performed by TSA agents, who traditionally shuffle bins to the front of the line throughout the day. In addition, these lanes allow up to five passengers to divest for screening at the same time, which is more efficient than single-file queues at most screening checkpoints.
- *The third objective: to improve the passenger experience.*—The Smart Lanes' five individual stations enable passengers to place items in the bins at their own pace. In effect, this set-up keeps slower passengers from holding up the line. Plus, the bins use a tracking mechanism so passengers do not have to wait to go through the body scanner at the same time as their bags. After passengers pick up their bags, the bins automatically return to the start of the line.

As I said, we opened our first two Smart Lanes in the spring of 2016. From our initial observations, those lanes proved successful, safely and efficiently speeding passenger throughput by as much as 30 percent. This is an important statistic when you're talking about reducing wait times and eliminating bottlenecks.

A standard security lane can screen, on average, 160 passengers per hour. A Smart Lane can screen, on average, 208 passengers per hour. During busy travel periods—like the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving—such expedited screening can make the difference between a 35-minute wait and an under 20-minute wait, which is Hartsfield-Jackson's overall goal for security screening.

Based on the success of our two pilot Smart Lanes, we decided to move forward with purchasing additional Smart Lanes to install in our Domestic Terminal.

It is important to mention that in our Domestic Terminal, we have three security checkpoints: Domestic South with four lanes; Domestic North with five lanes; and Domestic Main with 18 lanes. That's 27 security lanes total.

Beyond the two existing Smart Lanes, our goal was to add 20 more, converting the majority of the standard lanes. That would bring us to 22 Smart Lanes out of

27 security lanes total. The North checkpoint would have four Smart Lanes, South would have three, and Main would have 15.

Our initial two Smart Lanes were funded by a \$1 million investment from Delta Air Lines. Hartsfield-Jackson purchased the additional 20 lanes with airport dollars. That expenditure totaled about \$12.5 million. I should point out that, for the most part, U.S. airports are not funding these Smart Lanes themselves, but relying on airlines to foot the bill. However, given the vast amount of Origin and Destination traffic at Hartsfield-Jackson—combined with the efficiency from the pilot Smart Lanes program—we saw advantages early on and, of course, we were encouraged by Delta's initial investment.

Over the past year, we have phased in the installation of 20 Smart Lanes to minimize operational disruption to our passengers and maintain overall screening capacity.

We contracted with equipment provider MacDonald-Humphrey, and we worked with the company to make adjustments to our checkpoints to accommodate the Smart Lanes. Standard lanes are roughly 52 feet long. Smart lanes require an additional 25 feet of space, so there is a sizable footprint to this equipment.

We began the electrical work in October 16. Then in November, we installed one lane at Domestic South. And in December, we installed two lanes at Domestic North. Starting in January of this year, we staggered the installation of 15 Smart Lanes at Domestic Main and two additional lanes at Domestic North. We set a deadline of May of this year to complete installation of the 20 Smart Lanes, and I was told last week that we are ahead of schedule for the busy Memorial Day weekend travel.

Of course, we were mindful of how the installation would impact our customers. So each phase took into consideration several things: First, that our PreCheck lanes would “flex” to ensure that, at a minimum, four lanes remained open throughout the construction time line. Second, we made sure all lanes not under construction could be staffed if needed.

So now that 19 of 22 Smart Lanes have been installed and are in use, I want to offer a few observations:

- *First, it's clear that Smart Lanes speed passenger processing.*—We've seen that in action. But I should mention two important caveats: First, these Smart Lanes have been with us just shy of 1 year, so their performance over time will be the true measure of success. But based on our initial findings, we are pleased with the results. The second caveat is this: A learning curve exists for passengers who are unfamiliar with the technology. However, we are confident that, in time, people will understand the process and enjoy the convenience and time savings.
- *Second, it's clear that automation benefits both TSA and the airport.*—The automated bin system has relieved TSA agents of manual work involving the bins. But the Smart Lanes themselves have also provided security enhancements. If a suspicious bag is detected, it is kept secured from passengers without holding up the line.
- *Third, it's clear that Smart Lanes may help propel our long-term growth.*—As I mentioned earlier, this airport welcomed 104 million passengers in 2016. That's a 2.6 percent increase over our 2015 numbers. And we expect our passenger counts to continue climbing this year and beyond. So these Smart Lanes—combined with the renovation, modernization, and expansion of our facilities as part of our 20-year capital improvement program—will prove useful as we grow our operations to meet passenger demand well into the future.

I should also mention that while Hartsfield-Jackson has been the pioneer on testing these Smart Lanes, other airports have jumped on board. These airports include LAX, Chicago's O'Hare, Newark, and Dallas-Fort Worth.

Hartsfield-Jackson's pioneering efforts are due, in no small part, to strong working relationships we have cultivated with our stakeholders, particularly TSA. I want to express our team's gratitude to TSA Federal Security Director Mary Leftridge Byrd for the remarkable job she and her team do each day to ensure passenger safety and security while trying to achieve exemplary customer service. The world's busiest airport appreciates its cohesive and respectful relationship with TSA to achieve successful operations on a daily basis.

In closing, while it's too early to fully assess the strengths and weaknesses of Smart Lanes, our findings over the past year have shown positive results when it comes to enhancing safety, accelerating passenger processing, increasing operational efficiencies and improving the customer experience.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to address this body.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you, Mr. Council, for your testimony.

The Chair now recognizes Ms. Olivier for her testimony.

STATEMENT OF JEANNE M. OLIVIER, A.A.E., ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, AVIATION SECURITY AND TECHNOLOGY, SECURITY OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DEPARTMENT, THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY

Ms. OLIVIER. Chairman Katko, Ranking Member Watson Coleman, and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the checkpoint of the future and TSA's Innovation Task Force.

As assistant director of aviation security and technology for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey I oversee security operations for John F. Kennedy, LaGuardia, and Stewart International Airports in New York, and Newark Liberty International Airport in New Jersey.

There are, as you have heard, currently 17 automated screening lanes deployed at Newark. Deployments are also underway at Kennedy Airport, expected to be completed somewhat in—toward the end of May.

United Airlines purchased the automated screening equipment and paid for the necessary reconfiguration of the checkpoint at Newark Airport. The Port Authority appreciates, certainly, the investment that United was willing to make to provide these lanes.

The lanes have been well-received by our passengers at Newark and we have seen an increase in the throughput at the TSA security checkpoint, which has helped to maintain reasonable wait times and reduce congestion in the public queuing area. It is important to note, however, that although throughput has increased as a result of the automated screening lanes, the number of transportation security officers needed to effectively screen passengers has not been reduced.

The lanes funded by Newark—by United at Newark were proposed at a time of crisis when TSA was unable to meet the surging passenger demand last spring and summer due to insufficient TSA personnel and resources. Fortunately, Congress was able to authorize additional funding for TSA personnel, overtime, and canine deployments.

I would like to pause right here and say, Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the significant focus you and the committee dedicated to the checkpoint improvements last year. We could not have gotten through that without you.

We cannot neglect or cut back on the TSA resources needed today to maintain effective and efficient screening operations for passengers and baggage at airports across the country. Innovation and technology investments must be made in addition to the staffing levels needed to accommodate the significant growth in travel.

Newark alone has grown by 10 percent this year to date over last year.

While responsibility for passenger and baggage screening are by law the sole responsibility of the TSA, airports, of course, play a critical role in partnering with the agency to help it meet its core mission. Since last spring airports and air carriers have provided and continue to provide significant support for non-security functions and technology deployment at TSA security checkpoints. The

recent smooth and relatively seamless spring break travel this year highlights the effectiveness of this on-going partnership.

However, airport and air carrier resources are not infinite and private industry cannot and should not be made responsible for funding TSA's primary and fundamental responsibility for screening passengers and baggage effectively and efficiently. Federal funding resources are vital to ensure the long-term sustainability of TSA's Innovation Task Force.

The Port Authority and airports across the country welcome the opportunity to partner directly with TSA on additional agile and innovative solutions. We are eager to assist TSA and—with operational testing to ensure that innovative technologies or processes work effectively and do not inadvertently slow down passenger screening.

We also look forward to a checkpoint of the future that does not require people to divest shoes, coats, laptops, and might even allow them once again to carry food and beverages through the checkpoint.

As public entities, airports, just like the TSA, have public safety and security as their key mission. Just like the Federal Government, we need the flexibility and resources to spur innovative solutions that meet or exceed current security requirements. Local funding resources, like the passenger facility charge, can provide the resources necessary to facilitate investments at the local level to further enhance the myriad of airport security responsibilities.

In conclusion, the Port Authority and airport operators across the country support the Innovation Task Force and look forward to helping test innovative solutions. Federal funding is key to the long-term success of the Innovation Task Force.

The Innovation Task Force efforts must be on top of adequate staffing, canines, and other TSA resources needed to maintain the effectiveness and efficiency of the checkpoint of today.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Olivier follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JEANNE M. OLIVIER, A.A.E.

APRIL 27, 2017

Chairman Katko, Ranking Member Watson Coleman, and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the checkpoint of the future and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's collaboration with the Transportation Security Administration and its Innovation Task Force. I currently serve as assistant director, aviation security and technology for the Security Operations and Programs Department of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. In this capacity, I oversee security operations for New York's John F. Kennedy International, LaGuardia, and Stewart International airports and for Newark Liberty International Airport in New Jersey. I am also the second vice chair of the American Association of Airport Executives, which represents thousands of men and women across the country who manage and operate the Nation's airports.

The Port Authority's airport system served a combined 129.4 million passengers in 2016. Specifically, Newark Liberty International processed 40.4 million, John F. Kennedy International hosted 58.9 million, LaGuardia greeted 29.8 million, and Stewart International served 275,000. Newark's share of the NY/NJ area airport system passengers is 31.2 percent. It offers non-stop air service to more than 165 destinations aboard dozens of air carriers. Newark Liberty has an enormous economic impact on the region, responsible for: About 188,089 jobs, \$9.9 billion in annual wages, and \$27.2 billion in annual sales. Traffic at Newark Liberty is projected to grow by 5 percent in 2017, however, we have already seen an amazing actual growth of 10 percent this year to date over last year, far exceeding the National av-

erage of 2 to 4 percent traffic growth projected by the Federal Aviation Administration. Nation-wide, TSA anticipates a 4 percent growth in passenger volume and expects to screen 228 million passengers between Memorial Day and Labor Day compared to 217 million passengers last summer. Thus, effective and efficient passenger screening is very important for our successful operation and service to travelers.

Terminal C, operated solely by United Airlines, at Newark Liberty International Airport accounts for 57 percent of the airport's passenger volume, or 23.1 million travelers last year. There are currently 17 Automated Screening Lanes (ASL) deployed at Newark Liberty International Airport at the Terminal C checkpoint. The first of the lanes were installed in November 2016. United Airlines purchased the ASL equipment and paid for the necessary reconfiguration of the checkpoint area.

The new automated screening lanes offer several features that automate many of the functions previously conducted manually, which allows travelers to move more swiftly and efficiently through the checkpoint. These innovations include:

- Stainless steel countertops that were constructed to enable several passengers to place their items in bins simultaneously;
- Automated conveyor belts that draw bins into the X-ray machines, and return the bins back to the front of the queue for passengers;
- Carry-on bags that trigger an alarm warning of a potential threat are automatically pushed to a separate area to allow bins behind to continue through the screening process uninterrupted;
- Property bins that are 25 percent larger than the bins in standard screening lanes and large enough to hold roller bags;
- Unique Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tags that are attached to each bin to allow for additional accountability of a traveler's items as they transit throughout the security process; and
- Cameras that capture photographic images of the contents of each bin, which are linked side-by-side to the X-ray image of a bag's contents.

The lanes have been well received by passengers at Newark Liberty and have been working as intended. We have seen an increase in passenger throughput at the TSA security checkpoint, which has helped to maintain reasonable wait times and reduce congestion in the public queuing area. The PANYNJ appreciates the investment that United was willing to make to provide these lanes as faster throughput and reduced congestion improves the passenger experience and reduces vulnerabilities in the public area.

Although the ASLs get travelers through the TSA screening checkpoint at a faster pace, it is our understanding that they do not reduce the number of Transportation Security Officers needed to effectively screen passengers. TSA is currently conducting a detailed data collection covering all key checkpoint activity, including detection and alarm rates, throughput, operations, maintenance, optimal configurations and staffing ratios, at the four airports where automated screening lanes are currently deployed. We encourage TSA to carefully analyze the data before making any staffing allocation decisions or changes to its resource allocation model. The improvements provided by the ASLs would be quickly negated by a premature or short-sighted reduction of TSA screening personnel.

The ASLs funded by United at Newark Liberty were launched at a time of crisis when TSA was unable to meet the surging passenger demand last spring and summer due to insufficient TSA personnel and resources. Fortunately, Congress was able to authorize additional funding for TSA personnel, overtime, and canine deployments. It is vital that TSA receives the funding levels necessary to continue to ensure adequate TSO levels, canines, and other resources to maintain checkpoint efficiency.

At the same time, airport operators and air carriers joined in partnership with TSA to provide contract personnel to cover non-security functions at the checkpoint in addition to the investments made in automated screening lanes. Airport and air carrier support of TSA checkpoint operations continue today, and the reasonable wait times across the country during the recent spring break travel season highlights the effectiveness of this on-going partnership. However, airport and air carrier resources are not infinite, and private industry cannot and should not be made responsible for funding TSA's primary and fundamental responsibility for screening passengers and baggage effectively and efficiently.

Federal funding resources are vital to ensure the long-term sustainability of TSA's Innovation Task Force. Additionally, Federal funding resources will allow TSA to make investments solely on the merits of an innovative technology or process without the bias of competitive advantage factors inherent in private-sector funding decisions.

In addition to enhancing the passenger experience at airports through investments in ASLs and other technology, Federal funding holds the potential to spur

further technological and process innovations to fundamentally change checkpoint screening operating procedures. Possible enhancements include allowing passengers to pass through the checkpoint without stopping, taking off shoes or removing laptops from bags, carrying beverages and food while at the same time improving security and detection. As these technologies are developed, airports are eager to assist TSA with operational testing to ensure that these innovations work effectively in a challenging airport environment and do not inadvertently slow down passenger processing.

TSA's expedited screening program, PreCheck, provides a glimpse into the possibilities of a checkpoint of the future. The complementary program currently allows vetted and other eligible passengers to keep on their shoes and lightweight jackets and leave laptops and allowed liquids in their carry-on baggage. Unfortunately, PreCheck, as a Government-run procurement program, is not living up to its full potential.

Although TSA continues to slowly grow participation in the program, the PreCheck enrollment process is cumbersome, and enrollment options are severely limited. The private sector and industry stakeholders, including airport operators, have presented and advocated for innovative solutions that would increase participation in the PreCheck program and achieve the robust, critical mass levels originally envisioned for the program. TSA needs to follow the direction mandated by Congress in the FAA Extension, Safety and Security Act of 2016 to "publish application enrollment standards that add multiple private-sector application capabilities for the PreCheck program to increase the public's enrollment access to such program." We hope that TSA will soon follow the direction of Congress to coordinate with interested parties to deploy TSA-approved ready-to-market private sector solutions; partner with the private sector to use kiosks, mobile devices or other mobile enrollment platforms to make enrollment easier; and, consider leveraging existing resources and abilities at airports to conduct fingerprint and background checks.

While responsibility for passenger and baggage screening are by law the sole responsibility of TSA, airports play an essential role in partnering with the agency to help it meet its core mission. The PANYNJ looks forward to continuing to partner with TSA to ensure effective, efficient, and innovative security operations for the screening of passengers and baggage.

In addition to working with the TSA to meet its passenger and baggage screening mandates, airports perform a number of inherently local security-related functions at their facilities, including incident response and management, perimeter security, employee credentialing, access control, infrastructure and operations planning, and numerous local law enforcement and public safety functions.

Airport operators—just like the Federal Government—need the flexibility and resources to spur innovative solutions that meet or exceed current security requirements. Local funding sources, like the Passenger Facility Charge, can provide the resources necessary to facilitate innovation and technology investment at the local level to further enhance the myriad of airport security responsibilities.

The PANYNJ and airport operators across the country support the TSA's Innovation Task Force (ITF) efforts and look forward to more opportunities for direct partnership and engagement to test innovative solutions at the passenger checkpoint and throughout the airport environment. We hope that TSA's ITF can be sustainable for the long-term and enable the agency to be agile in its investment and deployment decisions. Agility is key to staying ahead of evolving threats to aviation, which continues to be a prime target for terrorists. Again, Federal funding for the ITF will be necessary to ensure TSA has the ability to work with all interested industry partners, including airport operators, and can focus on innovations that have the potential to fundamentally change the screening process.

In the mean time, we cannot neglect or cut back on the TSA personnel, canines, and other resources needed today to maintain effective and efficient screening operations for passengers and baggage at airports across the country. Innovation and technology investment must be made in addition to the staffing levels needed to accommodate the significant growth in air travel.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify. As public agents, the PANYNJ and my airport colleagues across the country take our security mission very seriously. We welcome the opportunity to partner with TSA to introduce new and innovative approaches to enhancing security throughout the airport environment.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you, Ms. Olivier.

Thank you for your kind words about the collaborative effort we had last summer to deal with a crisis with checkpoints. You know, no one person takes credit for it. It was a team effort and we all,

private sector and public sector worked together and solved the problem.

What a concept, everybody working together, right? So I think that is a good thing and we will continue to do that moving forward. That is, indeed, the goal of this committee.

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes of questions. But before I do that I will note votes were just called, so after my questions we will suspend until after votes. Sorry to keep you here longer, but that is how it goes.

Now, Mr. Karoly, I appreciate your testimony and I want to talk to you in a moment about the ITF and how we can make it better.

I just want to note, Mr. Council, for you that if I don't get to you in the first round of questions I most definitely will get to you in the second round because I want to talk to you a little bit more about what Atlanta is doing with respect to employee screening.

So first of all, with respect to the task force, I know, Mr. Karoly, that you have been heavily involved in looking at the automated screening lanes. Is that correct?

Mr. KAROLY. Yes, sir. It is one of our initiatives.

Mr. KATKO. OK. How long have you had the screening lanes up and moving?

Mr. KAROLY. So we started this endeavor, again, with Atlanta and Delta Air Lines back in April. It was a 9-week effort and we were able to deploy that by Memorial Day of 2016.

Mr. KATKO. OK. Is it only one airport they are being tested at or is it Nation-wide?

Mr. KAROLY. So we are testing them Nation-wide. We have, again, 51 ASL lanes and we are assessing each of those lanes, or the manufacturers, at various airports.

Mr. KATKO. OK. Then the second thing is upcoming demonstrations that haven't come on-line yet are the computed tomography, or basically 3-D scanners?

Mr. KAROLY. Yes, sir. It is the C.T. at the checkpoint, if you will.

Mr. KATKO. Right. Are they up and going yet, or no?

Mr. KAROLY. So we have tested them at the Transportation Security Lab in New Jersey for—to meet the detection standard, which two of the three have passed. We also have tested in the TSIF two of the three to go through we will say initial operational checks.

Right now they are working on one last change, if you will, to their software, and we will be deploying those: One to Phoenix Airport in the next 2 weeks if all goes well with the computer check, and then the other one either in Boston and/or Chicago.

Mr. KATKO. The third component I understand you are looking at—and we are—I am excited about all of it, but I am particularly excited about the use of biometrics and the biometric authentication technology, which is really one component of some of the advancing technologies out there. Have you done anything with the biometric authentication technology yet?

Mr. KAROLY. Yes, sir. It is presently in our Transportation Security Integration Facility going through some assessment before getting it out to the field for initial deployment for a pilot demonstration. We expect to get it out this summer if all goes well, and that is a biometric fingerprint collection technology, if you will.

Mr. KATKO. Now, is it fair to say that if the resources were better allocated to the task force that you might be able to get more of this technology out in a more expedited manner?

Mr. KAROLY. Sir, I guess as a systems engineer and acquisition professional I would say in a unconstrained environment we could always do more if we were to receive more. But obviously we are in a fiscally constrained environment and as long as the ITF receives funding as documented in the President's budget, I believe we can execute our mission in 2018.

Mr. KATKO. OK.

Now, of course we have to watch the budget. We have a terrible deficit.

But there is also—I know this is shocking so I am glad you are sitting down when I say this—but there are areas where agencies could find some waste and reallocate resources or reprioritize resources. When it comes to protecting the public and especially with respect to aviation, I think that is of paramount importance, and so getting the new and innovative products tested and to market, if you will, and on the front lines doing what they are intended to do quicker, I don't think we can dedicate enough resources to that.

So do you have any idea of what type of things you could do if you had more resources? Can you tell us what those resources are that you would need?

Mr. KAROLY. In an unconstrained environment, sir, I would think that I would focus—again, I would really have to think back how it ties together, but I would focus on functional areas.

So in other words, I think I would—we are doing planning and strategy today; I would do more planning and strategy for other initiatives. We are doing testing and assessment today; I would do more testing and assessment for other technologies.

Additionally, we dedicate some funds to our broad agency announcement, focusing on small businesses who can't actually fund maybe their assessments to an airport. So we would fund that travel. I would look at increasing that area.

Last, systems integration across the board as we integrate these systems into the field.

Mr. KATKO. OK. Do you have any idea of the amount of personnel you would need to do that, or the additional personnel and additional resources in order to achieve that goal?

Mr. KAROLY. Today we have 14 FTE working for the Innovation Task Force.

Mr. KATKO. Nation-wide just 14?

Mr. KAROLY. At the headquarters staff.

Mr. KATKO. OK.

Mr. KAROLY. But this is a big, again, as we always said, public-private partnership. A lot of TSA personnel are supporting it. Just the ITF staff themselves, but we work within TSA getting human factors, getting training folks, getting operation support folks.

So it is bigger than the 14, but your specific question was for ITF-related directly.

Again, I would have to go back, but the vision of the final operation capability of our organization within ORCA, our Office of Requirements and Capabilities Analysis, was looking at about 25 FTE for the Innovation Task Force.

Mr. KATKO. OK. What I would like you to do—my time is up. Before I do it, I would ask you to do is go back with your folks and, you know, come up with a couple of different scenarios whereby specifics with respect to personnel, and get back to us within a few weeks as to what, you know, what we could do to help really, truly turbocharge this task force idea.

Because what we want to do is be able to get the technologies, like I said, that is cutting-edge on the front lines working as they are supposed to much quicker than we are currently doing. One of the keys to that is Innovation Task Force, and the public-private partnership component of this is a wonderful idea and it is just—but it does things TSA has done a long time.

So let's try and figure out a way to step it up. If you can get back with a proposal within a week, or 2 weeks at the most, I would very, very much appreciate it because we are going to begin the authorization process, and I want to include this in part of that process, OK?

Mr. KAROLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KATKO. All right. Thank you.

Now, Mrs. Watson Coleman likes to be on time, and I am a little bit different in that regard. So we are going to gavel out and go upstairs and vote, and as soon as we are done with votes I ask everybody to come back here and we will continue with the hearing.

[Recess.]

Mr. KATKO. The committee is back in session. I wanted to apologize for the delay, but we don't keep the schedule on the floor of the House, we just go when they tell us to go, as I hope you understand.

The Chair now recognizes the Ranking Member, Mrs. Watson Coleman, for 5 minutes of questions.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, Ms. Olivier, excuse me for messing up your name. I just didn't look at it.

One of the things you indicated was that soon JFK was going to have these smart lanes. Did I hear that correctly?

Ms. OLIVIER. Yes, Congresswoman.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. My question is, who is paying for them?

Ms. OLIVIER. The airlines.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. The airlines.

Ms. OLIVIER. Yes. So at Kennedy it is Delta for T-2 and T-4 and then American Airlines for T-8.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. OK.

So I guess, Mr. Karoly—did I say that right? Because I think I messed your name up, too.

Mr. KAROLY. You did, ma'am. All good.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Oh, good. Thank you. Thank you.

What are you doing about the airports that can't—that don't have the kind of relationship with airlines, that don't have an airline that is willing to install these? What is TSA's role here, and what should we be expecting, and what would you need?

Mr. KAROLY. So right now, ma'am, we are under what we call an urgent operational need authority, and that authority gave us permission to go deploy these, working with our stakeholders, to these

21 airports. So we are working with all of those airports to figure out what best works for them at this point in time.

So again, the airlines are negotiating, if you will, with the airport authority, and the airport authority negotiating with the airlines. Then once that initial engagement occurs then TSA gets involved, if you will, to work together to actually deploy these at those airports.

So I believe right now we don't need anything additional to execute under that UON requirement.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. So, but is this an assumption that TSA won't have to actually use its financial resources to install these in any airport, that you would only be responsible for operation and maintenance?

Mr. KAROLY. This summer, ma'am, we are going to go and decide, using the data that we are getting now through the assessments, to determine if this becomes a program of record for TSA. So——

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. A pardon-me of record?

Mr. KAROLY. It is called a program of record, a real acquisition program of record.

If it is determined through the data cost-benefit analysis that it makes sense for us to—that—for it to become a program of record, we will end up starting to procure these in the out years, if you will. That is the plan.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I guess this is for both Ms. Olivier and Mr. Council—and thank you, also, for being here. What has been the most noticeable difference in your interactions with TSA since the creation of the task force? How can Congress be helpful as you try to keep moving your respective organizations forward in improving both passenger services and security?

Mr. Council and, again, Ms. Olivier.

Mr. COUNCIL. Thank you, Congressman.

So we have somewhat of an outstanding relationship with our TSA partners in Atlanta. You know, they have been on board the whole way, especially when it comes to the smart lanes, you know.

One condition that I think that I mentioned to you that with the smart lanes TSA needed to own those lanes to be able to operate them, OK? So we had to gift those lanes to TSA. Of course, our stakeholder in Georgia allowed us to actually do that, which I am assuming then will be the responsibility of TSA to handle the operations and the maintenance of those.

So we have had to do that to get certified lanes for use.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you.

Mr. COUNCIL. Yes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. So let me just ask you, Mr. Karoly, is that your sort of understanding the way TSA—how it would operate in that space? You would be responsible for owning these lanes, operating them, and ensuring the maintenance of them?

Mr. KAROLY. Yes, ma'am. That is how it is working today, that, again, of those that are deployed either the airlines or airport would gift it to us and/or bail, which is another term that they use.

But as part of the negotiation between the ASL manufacturer and the airline or the airport there is a 2-year maintenance warranty period, so that is covered under their initial costs. Once that

2-year warranty period is up we, the Government, will end up taking that maintenance at that point.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Olivier, do you have comments to this question?

If it is red it is on. Only here.

Ms. OLIVIER. Thank you.

Yes, Congresswoman. We do feel that we have a very good working relationship with the local TSA as well as those Nationally to promote innovative technologies, and we are always eager to help pilot new activities.

I would say that our interaction at the National level for the task force, that largely occurred between United and the task force itself. But, of course, we then provide all of the oversight for ensuring the equivalent of building code, you know, correctness, and we have the security oversight during the construction periods. Those things were all—engaged the Port Authority resources.

Locally, both the TSA and the Port Authority, as well as United, are very excited about the improvements in the screening checkpoint.

I would caution the issue of maintenance, though. We have noticed at all of our airports that if there is a weak link in the chain it is that maintenance contract. While I have not—I can't link that to the innovation lanes, I can link it—and there are no secrets in this; we all know that there are some issues with the Government contract to get the maintenance done in a timely way and to have parts delivered in a very timely way.

Local TSA folks are extremely creative if they have to cannibalize parts from one machine to keep another one working, but the actually delivery of parts is a problem. I think the TSA needs some help and inspection in that contract.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you. That is actually good information for us to have.

I just have one quick question.

You all mentioned the fact that even with these smart lanes that does not mean that there is going to be a need for less TSA personnel. You also talked about the importance of canines in ensuring safety and security.

So I am wondering if you have any thoughts about any budget proposals that you have seen or heard about as it relates to perhaps diminishing some of the resources and the capacity of the TSA to provide those personnel and those canines. I would like to ask both Mr. Council and Ms. Olivier to respond.

Mr. COUNCIL. For us, any reduction below the current level will clearly have somewhat of an impact for us, mainly based on the volume that we actually generate at Hartsfield-Jackson. But we haven't seen that yet.

But if there is any kind of proposed reduction then, of course, that means that we would have to work in collaboration with our local TSA to see just what that means to us, alright, because for now we are not looking just at managing the current demand that we have. We know that our demand is actually going up, alright, and we want to make sure that we are properly in place with the

amount of resources that is actually needed for us to keep things going.

Again, understand for us that as soon as we can get people through security and to get on the secure side then they become less of a target, and we try to reduce that by minimizing the wait times for most of our passengers.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you.

I don't know if you wanted to respond to that.

Ms. OLIVIER. I agree completely. We know that it is a difficult time and that budgets are constrained, so we are very sensitive to that.

But any diminution in the staffing for screeners at our facilities we fear we are going to revisit March of last year. We don't feel that we can lose that.

Just in terms of funding many of the initiatives, whether it is the—going forward with the Innovation Task Force or other aspects of these operations, obviously we are concerned that there is an aviation security fee that is part of what goes on a plane ticket and that those funds are currently being used to, you know, cover the deficit—the Federal deficit—as opposed to going to the TSA for use in things like innovation and other screeners. So certainly we are concerned about that.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you.

I just want to mention, Olivia, I hope this has been a good experience for you and you are proud of your father. Of course, he has done so well in his appearance before us today.

Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you.

The Chair will now recognize other Members of the subcommittee for 5 minutes for questions they may wish to ask the witnesses. In accordance with our committee rules and practice, I plan to recognize Members who were present at the start of the hearing by seniority on the subcommittee. Those coming in later will be recognized in the order of their arrival.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Higgins, for 5 minutes of questions.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Council, I would like to advise you, sir, that I traverse to your airport many, many, many times, and it is a testament to your own management and your people that it is much less stressful through the TSA screening lanes than it is to get through the baggage checkpoint at Delta, so that is a shift for sure. Congratulations.

Mr. COUNCIL. Thank you, sir.

Mr. HIGGINS. The use of canines, it has been proven again and again that the canine dogs, well-trained with a canine officer, are highly effective at detecting residue or the presence of explosive materials or gunpowder. We have used them effectively for many years in different aspects of securing our country, including the military, of course, and law enforcement.

You stated that the use of canines has been crucial to the success of your own TSA screening. So I would ask you, considering the sort of old-tech effectiveness of a canine and a trained officer, and

specifically regarding a PreCheck line or perhaps in the future something beyond PreCheck—for instance, frequent flyers and trusted travelers that are perhaps Government employees that have already in possession of a significant security clearance through the U.S. Government, something perhaps that you may envision beyond a PreCheck level, would not the use of an officer and a canine be enough without the investment in technologies and whatnot to completely screen a PreCheck customer, a flyer—frequent flyer, someone that has been entrusted with some envisioned level of PreCheck beyond what currently exists?

Mr. COUNCIL. So, Congressman, clearly the canines have been a very useful tool for us, you know, and we try to use them as expeditiously as we can. I think currently we have 10 canine units.

What is so amazing about them is that—and what I have learned is that, you know, that people oftentimes ask, you know, why don't they see more? Well, it is because they can't really work in close proximity to each other because it sort of throws them off.

They are so sensitively and highly tuned to where it really sort-of negates their ability to detect when they are in close proximity to another canine. So it sort-of works in a certain way.

You know, I would say that given the emergent threats that seem to be almost on a constant basis, you know, I would think, you know, that eliminating any kind of possible resource that we have that could possibly detect anything, you know, would be, you know, something that I think that we would have to be careful with. You know, I can't really speak to maybe what TSA would actually do when it comes to that, you know, which is sort-of in their space about how they manage that. All the canines are TSA canines.

You know, but from our perspective, you know, safety and security, again, is first and foremost for us. So whatever gets people through this airport safely and securely, then we are all for it. We are all for it.

Mr. HIGGINS. We are on the same page. I bring it up, sir, because in an airport during the course of my travels over the last few months the backpack that I always carry was side-barred for searching. I had left a can of Red Bull in there I didn't know about—I had forgotten. So that needed to be checked, obviously, and I understood that.

But during that process my backpack was swabbed. I can only assume that would have been for gunpowder residue. Would that be correct?

Mr. COUNCIL. I think TSA would probably——

Mr. HIGGINS. Swab would be put into——

Mr. KAROLY. Yes, sir, for explosive trace.

Mr. HIGGINS. OK. Well, that technology did not work because in that backpack on countless occasions I have carried firearms and ammunition for a couple years in that backpack.

I think it is important as we move forward and we look at technologies and consider technologies that sometimes old-school works very well relative to new technologies, and especially within this era of a \$20 trillion debt, as we seek to protect the people's treasure as we move forward in looking at the best ways to manage our

TSA systems and get our flyers through the airport safely and on time.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you, Mr. Higgins.

I would like to take the opportunity, since we don't have many other people questioning today, just to do another round of questions. I want to speak to Mr. Council and Ms. Olivier, in particular.

In advance of the question, I encourage both of you to speak frankly because we can't improve the ITF unless we have frank discussions. So given the fact that getting the technology to—from a testing phase to an operational phase is so critically important, especially given the emerging threats, which are pretty evident from what happened with—in overseas airports, where we had—people can't even bring laptops on planes. The bad guys are constantly evolving the threat matrix and we need to respond in a more efficient and prompt manner.

So with that as a backdrop I ask you, what else should we be doing with the ITF to make them better, make it more efficient?

Mr. COUNCIL. So I think some of the things that you mentioned, which is the biometric screening, you know, as well as the C.T. scans, you know, they seem to have actually worked. You know, there is a lot of new technology that is more international in its concept, OK, that we don't deploy here.

So for the most part, you know, as we have communicated with TSA, we are in favor of actually being a test bed for anything that seems to be a new opportunity to us better protect the passengers that we have that is coming through. You know, and at any point we are to be willing to actually talk to them about what is needed to actually get that done.

I think they have been very gracious on a lot of occasions because of the amount of traffic that we have. You know, so I, you know, I just think that from what I can see—I can only talk about the things that have been introduced to us, which is trying to do things that would allow us to try to protect people before they get to the checkpoints, all right, you know, and that is always the most serious part for us, you know, that white space that we talk about between the front door when you get out of your car on the curb and you get to the checkpoint is the thing that actually—that is what our focus is when it comes to security, and trying to make sure those people can get to the secured side of the airport, which is behind TSA, you know?

So, you know, I mean, any effort that actually allows us to be able to do that—and we have taken steps ourselves, you know, to ensure that. You know, we have been hyper-vigilant when it comes to that area and trying to protect that area, you know, and we constantly—it is always—we are always on the lookout for things that can come about that can give us new ideas in terms of how we can respond quickly, how we can identify, and how we can prevent.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you, Mr. Council.

Ms. Olivier.

Ms. OLIVIER. I wish I had said all that.

But I will give you a couple other things that I would love to see the task force work on, certainly the continuing algorithms. They need to be able to adapt algorithms very quickly, and I know that

they are adding new ones at these innovation lanes, but we need to take a look at how quickly they could adapt algorithms throughout the country even in the legacy installations when we pick up that there is a new threat.

So we also need to continue to look at the human factor element on the part of the screeners. There is a lot that goes on at these screening checkpoints, and how can we understand a way to be able to allow those screeners to maximize their acuity in picking up issues in baggage and to minimize distractions in what can be a very busy environment.

Beyond that, I would like to see the innovation lane focus expanded out a bit to a distance detection, because when people come in through the front doors, to the extent that you have a stand-off detection of somebody with explosives on them—and Mr. Higgins' dogs would help with that, but they are in short supply. But other technology that gives you some stand-off detection would help you dealing with the threat in the public spaces even before people get to the checkpoint, so that is also pretty critical. I would like to see some work in that area.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you.

I just want one last question, and I am going to switch gears here considerably so I won't have to do another round of questions, and that is for Mr. Council.

We had a discussion yesterday before you came in about what Atlanta is doing with respect to screening of all employees. If you could briefly summarize for everyone what that is I would appreciate it, because that is going to be a narrative that is going to be examined going forward.

We just had an access controls bill passed out of the House this week, and it is going to mandate that an analysis be done about screening all employees—or potential for screening all employees at airports Nation-wide. I know the hue and cry is going to be, "It can't be done." Well, you are the largest airport in the country, one of the largest in the world. Please tell everyone what you are doing with respect to screening employees.

Mr. COUNCIL. I can, Mr. Chairman.

So basically right now at Hartsfield-Jackson we are doing a full screening and inspection for all of our employees, especially those that have SIDA access, and SIDA is security identification area, which is those people that actually can get out on the airfield and have access to planes.

So right now we have been very fortunate that all of the stakeholders that would have a role in this have agreed to be willing participants in this screening process. That includes the airlines; it includes concessionaires, and all of the people that make up the whole eco-chain within the airport.

So currently every airline except Delta, who is our major hub carrier, comes through four screening locations that we have at our airport, OK? Those that are Delta employees who have that—Delta actually has a screening process on their secure lot.

When you get to their secure lot it takes a SIDA badge to get into that lot, and once they get onto that lot then they are also screened before they get on the buses that will take them to the airfield. That screening involves checking of their bags, some of the

explosive trace detection, the swabs as well as some of the hand wands.

But once those employees are actually checked then they are led to a sterile environment to where there cannot be any kind of outside influence on those employees before they get on the bus. That sterile area is actually manned by security guards.

So once they get on the bus and make their way up toward the airfield, before they get into the airfield then there is another stop that is there and there is another possibility for a random search there by VIPR and other security personnel that will again ensure that everybody that is on that bus, you know, has, to the most part, been screened. So that is very important for us.

But for non-Delta employees, all other employees——

Mr. KATKO. Let me interrupt you, just before you get to non-Delta.

Mr. COUNCIL. Sure.

Mr. KATKO. But the bus does go and they bring them into the airport and they go directly into a secure area so they don't get released to the public before they go into the airport, correct?

Mr. COUNCIL. That is exactly correct.

Mr. KATKO. OK. All right.

Mr. COUNCIL. Yes. Yes. That is a very good point, sir.

So all other airport employees actually go through four of the screening locations that we have, and those screening locations include metal detector, X-ray machines, explosive trace, as well as hand wands. They will also get pat-downs if there is an alarm or alert that is actually hit once they go through the machines.

So we have started this process now and we are probably in our second year. The good thing, in terms of what Delta is doing, is by the end of this year they will also be installing the metal detectors and the X-ray machines.

So, so far it has been working for us. The stakeholders have been very diligent in their efforts, and we feel that it has made a big difference at Hartsfield-Jackson.

Mr. KATKO. We could go on and on, but I want to commend you for doing that. If the world's largest airport can do it and the costs associated with it can somehow be absorbed—I know Delta is paying for their own screening and I know it is a substantial sum of money, but they—you can't put a value on safety.

When you are plugging a security gap as big as this one, the way you are doing it in an effective manner, I just want to say for the record we very much applaud it and we appreciate it, and the committee appreciates and applauds your efforts, so thank you very much.

Mr. COUNCIL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KATKO. With that, the Chair now recognizes Mrs. Watson Coleman for questions.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you.

I just really am prompted to ask one question, and this has to do with the Fort Lauderdale situation, where a person picked up his baggage, which contained his gun, and then had his ammunition separated, and then he goes into the bathroom, and then he comes out and you know what happens. So my question is, I know that has got to be something that you all are thinking about or re-

acting to, and I just wanted to know what you all are doing in that space.

Mr. COUNCIL. So for us, yes, that situation—and it is amazing that that situation in itself has not happened before it actually happened. You know, but that is the challenge as an airport that we have, managing, you know, what happens in that non-secure space.

You know, for us prevention is always what we try to work on, but it is also how quickly we can respond and what mitigation plans we have to put in place as soon as we can when something like that actually happens, you know. This is something that we train on. You know, we train judiciously to try to react and to try to make sure that we move those people that could be affected, you know, in a very safe way and get out of harm's way.

But to be quite frank with you, it is very difficult to prevent, you know, so that is why we spend so much time in trying to recognize behavior. We have people that are plainclothesmen that literally look at behavior of passengers, you know, and try to detect and try to pick up, you know, nuances that could lead us to think that this is someone that we need to watch.

But the majority of our efforts, in addition to that, is really around, how do we mitigate and respond as quickly as we can to an event to try to minimize it?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. You all have plain-clothes security.

Mr. COUNCIL. Yes—

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Are they armed?

Mr. COUNCIL. I believe they are.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. OK.

Mr. COUNCIL. Yes, they are.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Ms. Olivier?

Ms. OLIVIER. Yes, Congressman.

The Port Authority has actually written to the administrator of the—the acting administrator of the TSA about this, making several suggestions certainly that include separating the checking of these weapons and when it comes time to receive them that they be received in a different area from the baggage area where other baggage is, and that, in fact, the airlines be required to notify the receiving airport that they are shipping through weaponry so that the airport can make a decision on whether it should deploy its police, its armed LEOs, to the point where those weapons are reclaimed.

Also, as I think you are sensitive in our region, we are very concerned throughout our region about guns and the access to guns in our New York-New Jersey area. Often we find that passengers who are resident in another State, another locale, licensed to carry the guns, are unaware of the local laws. If you are not licensed to carry a gun in New York City, for example, when you arrive and you, you know, unwrap your gun, you are not allowed to be carrying that alone unless you have a local license, and you are potentially subject to arrest.

We feel that the airlines, understanding that they are checking a weapon and understanding what the destination of this passenger is, should give advanced warning to those passengers that, “Wait a minute, if you are not licensed to carry you probably

should not be bringing this to New York.” So we urge that some action be taken in that regard to require airlines to deliver those messages, as well.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Could I ask that the copy of those suggestions be sent to us so that we might look at them?

Ms. OLIVIER. We will do so.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. KATKO. Yes. I was just going to ask the same thing, for sure.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Higgins for any further questions he may have.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Karoly, regarding the technology for smart lanes, I am seeing on this handout that there are five models for smart lanes. Is that correct?

Mr. KAROLY. Yes, sir. There are five manufacturers and then there is the integration of both a Smiths and a Rapiscan X-ray, so there are virtually 10 different configurations from five manufacturers.

Mr. HIGGINS. Have all five of these models been deployed at the testing airports, at the pilot airports?

Mr. KAROLY. Right now, sir, the only deployed model is the MacDonald Humfrey and Rapiscan.

Mr. HIGGINS. That is the model that, Mr. Council, you have in your airport, is the MacDonald Humfrey?

Mr. COUNCIL. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HIGGINS. Perhaps I missed that in earlier testimony. If I did I apologize.

Is there intention as you expand the program, sir, to deploy the other four models, whereby they might be measured for their efficiency and effectiveness?

Mr. KAROLY. Yes, sir. That is the plan, working with our stakeholders. We just approved the Vanderlande and Rapiscan system, so that is a system that is available to airports and airlines; and we just approved the Scarabee Smiths system for the same thing.

We are still going through—undergoing testing with the two remaining systems, but once that is complete that will be available for other airlines and airports to deploy.

Mr. HIGGINS. OK.

Regarding, Mr. Council, you—it was very encouraging to hear the screening that is taking place for the employees, airport employees, at your airport, so that is a question I had posed to some ladies and gentlemen that testified before this committee some month or so ago. It is very encouraging to hear that.

But how would we balance that against airports that do not have screening access like that and procedures in place, given the fact that the airplane itself that we are trying to assure that that aircraft has not had a weapon, say, planted on it somewhere by some employee—that is the reason we are screening our employees, right?

So how can we balance that against the fact that other airports do not have such stringent—or some other airports, perhaps—where that plane that comes to your airport is not—has come from an airport that has—does not have that screening for their employees?

So how do we balance that, and how would this committee move forward with recommendations for TSA to correct that?

Mr. COUNCIL. So I think that basically the whole notion of employee screening has to be just more pervasive through other airports.

Mr. HIGGINS. No doubt.

Mr. COUNCIL. Yes. That literally has to be where we start.

You know, I think that the job that we feel like that we have done, you know, in all cases we are trying to deter, you know, we are trying to prevent, you know, anything that could actually happen. One of the issues that we had that kicked all of this off was the transport of weapons that was found from an employee at Hartsfield-Jackson, you know, and we soon learned that there was—that was something that was part of something larger and stuff.

So that incident itself has put us in the position where we are now, to where we try to scrutinize our employees a whole lot better than that.

In terms of any guns that are coming in, you know, it just depends on how they come in. You know, and if it is part of somebody's checked baggage—that incident that happened in Fort Lauderdale—again, it is really tough to try to prevent.

Mr. HIGGINS. Right. It would be more speaking of, like, intentional planting of a weapon by an employee.

If I could shift this question to Mr. Karoly, would you be the gentleman that is receiving incoming new technologies? For instance, here are several technologies here that are as yet untested. Is there any pending technology that would be deployed to test arriving aircraft, the aircraft themselves, that would potentially detect within the passenger compartments of the aircraft some potential threat like a planted handgun?

Mr. KAROLY. Sir, we are not working in that area today. We do have a broad agency announcement that we will be releasing, our second one, in a couple weeks, and with that broad agency announcement it asks for state-of-the-art we will say technologies, process changes, to better secure the transportation environment, if you will. So—

Mr. HIGGINS. That would include the aircraft itself?

Mr. KAROLY. It could include the aircraft if somebody proposed that information, sir. Yes, sir, but we are not doing it today.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Thank you all for testifying today.

Mr. KATKO. Thank you, Mr. Higgins.

I would like to thank all of the three witnesses here today for their testimony. It was excellent. We covered a wide range of topics and really very thought-provoking subject matter came up for us, so I appreciate it.

I want to really reiterate that the primary goal, in my mind, of the ITF is to give them the tools necessary to expand their operations so that more and better technology can be tested on a more expedited manner and so we can get the good ideas on the front lines to keep our country protected as emerging threats—and ever-

evolving emerging threats, as we know—from the bad guys can be properly detected and thwarted.

So that is the goal of this hearing. That is the goal of our inquiry going forward.

So, Mr. Karoly, if you could get us a response by May 5 to the inquiry we made to you on the record I would very much appreciate that.

I would like to thank everyone else and my fellow committee Members here for their excellent questions.

We may have additional questions for the witnesses, and we will ask you to respond to these in writing.

Pursuant to committee rule VII(D), the hearing record will be open for 10 days.

Without objection, the subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:29 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

QUESTIONS FROM CHAIRMAN JOHN KATKO FOR STEVE KAROLY

Question 1. How has the Innovation Task Force sought to improve the way TSA develops, tests, and deploys new technologies into the field?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2a. What changes, if any, should be made to the relationship between DHS S&T and TSA in regards to how we procure and field new technologies?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2b. Is there a way to better collaborate on developing capabilities similar to the creation of the DHS Joint Requirements Council, which was created to help unify procurement requirements across individual DHS components?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 3. How does the Innovation Task Force inform the development of the mandatory *Five-Year Strategic Technology Investment Plan*?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 4. What is TSA doing to assess the impact new technologies like the Automated Screening Lanes will have on the current staffing allocation model?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 5a. Last year, TSA screened over 738 million passengers of which nearly 97 million were international departures from the top 20 airports in the United States. For those foreign visitors departing the United States, State and CBP has already collected their biometrics and completed a fair amount of vetting prior to their entry into the United States.

Given the vetting conducted by State and CBP prior to entry, is it possible to leverage that information gathering, vetting, link analysis, and move those foreign visitors into a known traveler lane?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 5b. Would you give us an update on what conversations you have had with CBP in this regard?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 6. In what ways would you say the Innovation Task Force has impacted the way in which TSA approaches technology solutions at the passenger screening process?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 7a. Now and in the future, is the ITF planned to be a “checkpoint of the future” to simply demonstrate mature and pre-mature technologies and impress/urge the public/airports/airlines?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 7b. Or is ITF designed to quickly integrate new, needed technologies, gather critical OT experience and data, and be able to fast-track those capabilities into airports?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 8a. ITF emerged out of a process engineering issue in wait times. How does that “priority” fit into the other TSA priorities of cyber, HME, employee screening, liquid explosives, etc.?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 8b. How does the ITF advance a priority in concert with the existing TSA technology prioritization, security vulnerability, and testing goals?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 8c. Has ITF identified its priorities or is everything a priority?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 9a. A well-defined procurement path or airport security requirement has to be aligned with the ITF for technology companies large and small to meaningfully participate.

How does the ITF work align with development of the Five-Year Acquisition Plan?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 9b. If not, why not?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 10. The ITF has potential value, however, if the demonstrated technologies are then sent to the TSIF potentially, upstaging long-standing T&E activities, makes existing manpower and resourcing problem worse.

What personnel and resourcing is TSA devoting to this effort without diluting existing and vital requirement development, equipment testing, and evaluation?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 11. If ITF in no way reduces the time it takes to develop requirements and get technology to the checkpoint either with airport or TSA dollars and perhaps worse, disrupts installation of needed upgrades and replacement of existing technologies then it's been a colossal waste of effort.

How will TSA be able to reduce the time it takes to get technology deployed using the ITF process?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 12. Innovation lane-approved projects have included CT scanners, biometrics, mobile ETDs and airport staffing models. However, what's not clear is what is the resourcing to bring these solutions to bear.

What does TSA need in terms of funding the ITF to be able to test multiple technologies, collect operational data, and write requirements documents?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 13. What feedback have you received from front-line Transportation Security Officers who are working at the various innovation lanes in place at airports across the country?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 14. Does TSA have a plan to institutionalize the Task Force or attempt to connect its findings into existing programs and offices at TSA?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 15a. Has the ITF demonstrated any new technologies at surface transportation hubs?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 15b. If no, why not?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 16. How can TSA and DHS S&T work together better when it comes to developing not only joint requirements, but capabilities as well?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 17. How do you believe TSA as an agency can be better structured to support innovation when it comes to screening technologies?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM RANKING MEMBER WATSON COLEMAN FOR STEVE KAROLY

Question 1a. How many small-to-medium businesses participate in the ITF?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 1b. How is TSA working to keep the small-to-medium businesses engaged and contributing to new passenger screening technologies?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2. What has the Innovation Task Force accomplished since the initial stand-up in spring of 2016?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 3a. What is the long-term plan for the Innovation Task Force going forward?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 3b. Where does the Innovation Task Force fall in the priorities for TSA?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 4a. What has TSA's outreach to the flying public about changes in screening procedures been?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 4b. What are the long-term plans for letting the flying public know what to expect in the screening changes that will be coming to their airports?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 5. With the roll-out of the demonstrations and communicating with passengers, how is TSA taking into account persons with disabilities or those who speak different languages and how the new technologies might impact their travel?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 6a. In the past, TSA has rolled out technology that was controversial. When the first generation advanced imaging technology machines were rolled out there was mass confusion and concerns about the review process for the devices.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 6b. How has the Task Force improved TSA's review products before putting them through to demonstrations?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 7. What is the Task Force's interaction with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 8. The Task Force seems as if it has been a solid example to public and private sectors partnering to make a positive impact.

What resources or assistance do you think the Task Force needs from the private sector to continue to help build on the work that has been completed thus far?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 9. Please describe the interplay between the Task Force, the Transportation Security Laboratory (TSL) and TSA Systems Integration Facility (TSIF).

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 10. How does the Task Force prioritize technologies?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM CHAIRMAN JOHN KATKO FOR ROOSEVELT COUNCIL, JR.

Question 1. What do you believe to be the primary takeaways from the innovation lanes in place at your airport?

Answer. A primary takeaway from the project management aspect of installing the Automated Screening Lanes (ASLs) was the importance of putting in place the required electrical infrastructure ahead of the ASL installation. Setting up the infrastructure in advance saved time and minimized the duration of out-of-service equipment. From an operational aspect, the primary takeaway is that compared with a standard lane, an ASL increases passenger throughput by as much as 30 percent. As passenger growth in originating traffic continues to climb, the increased throughput helps our airport minimize lines and keep wait times at or below 20 minutes.

Question 2. What are the primary challenges to implementing new screening technologies at airports, such as automated screening lanes?

Answer. Aside from funding, the primary challenge of implementing a new technology, especially one that interfaces with the traveling public, is the passenger's adjustment to the new process. In the case of ASLs, even PreCheck travelers and other frequent fliers have faced a learning curve with the new process. With standard screening lanes, for instance, only certain items needed to be placed in a bin. The ASL, on the other hand, requires all items be placed in a bin. At this point, familiarization and constant communication with the traveling public are the only solutions. Of course, all airports may not install the same technologies, leading to possible uncertainty and confusion as the traveling public navigates different processes. Another major challenge is available checkpoint floor area. ASLs and other technologies can require a larger footprint, forcing some area-constrained checkpoints to make major building modifications to install these new technologies.

Question 3. Do you think that the TSA's Innovation Task Force (ITF) is well-positioned to implement solutions from findings derived from the innovation lanes at your airport?

Answer. Yes, we are confident that ITF is well-positioned to implement solutions based on findings from the innovation lanes. Since the first ASL installation 1 year ago, the city of Atlanta, the Transportation Security Administration and our airline partners have worked with the task force to test several process improvements. Such improvements include dual AIT screening, cross-lane screening and remote screening. We believe testing these new initiatives at the world's busiest airport gives ITF the information needed to implement changes at other large airports Nation-wide.

Question 4. What are airports doing to support technology innovation at TSA and how do you perceive the relationship on this front between stakeholders and the agency?

Answer. We are pleased to report that the relationship between the city of Atlanta, our partner airlines, and TSA has always been—and remains—strong. We pride ourselves in supporting TSA's technology initiatives. We recently provided design support, added capacity to our electrical infrastructure, and constructed additional facilities for TSA to conduct a remote screening room pilot program.

Question 5. What insight do you have into how TSA develops, procures, and deploys new technologies at airports? How can this process be made more effective?

Answer. As an airport, we have little insight into how TSA develops and procures technology. It is our understanding that ITF brings new technologies to airports and its stakeholders for consideration. Stakeholders then decide which technologies to test. In terms of deployment, once new technologies are tested and approved, the airport is heavily involved in the process.

Question 6. What solutions do you believe TSA should focus on in the medium- and long-term to usher in a new era of security screening at airports?

Answer. In the mid-term, TSA should continue to advance automation using biometrics in passenger screening and find ways to automate oversized baggage screening. As more airlines and companies such as Clear continue to test and implement biometrics for passenger check-in, we should expect that this service would eventually be tested as part of the passenger screening process.

In the long term, one focus should be to improve exit lane technologies. Currently, few options exist for automation of passenger exiting from secured to unsecured areas of the airport. Our exit lanes are staffed 24/7 and several are ADA-challenged. Finding an exit lane technology that reduces the required staffing while improving overall airport security would be beneficial.

Question 7a. Based on the experience of your airport, how well is TSA positioned as an agency to spur innovation at the checkpoint?

Answer. All stakeholders share in the responsibility of spurring innovation, but the airport does not see TSA's role to encourage such innovation. Instead, we believe TSA should focus its efforts on ensuring that any innovation being introduced can enhance security and improve efficiencies.

Question 7b. What role and responsibility should stakeholders have in regards to such innovation?

Answer. All stakeholders have a role to play when it comes to innovation. Airlines continue to improve efficiencies and enhance customer service—all while lowering costs. In finding those efficiencies, airlines provide recommendations on what new technologies may offer the best passenger experience. An airport's role and responsibility should be to provide assistance and support with facility needs. Such was the case with the ASLs, as the airport assisted the TSA with infrastructure and facility needs.

Question 8a. Do you believe that the Innovation Task Force has been focusing on the aspects of security technology that are most in need of attention?

Answer. Yes. Based on recent terror attacks on public airports and long checkpoint lines experienced last year, we believe the Innovation Task Force has focused on the current needs of passenger screening.

Question 8b. Are there other areas of the airport, such as checked baggage, in which technology needs to be improved but has not been a focus of the ITF?

Answer. Yes, past deficiencies of the inline baggage system are being corrected with the EDS recapitalization program. This program will bring improvements in baggage scanning technology and the overall inline baggage system. However, we still need to improve baggage screening technologies to reduce alarm rates on liquids, gels, and aerosols. Such equipment improvements are necessary to increase the accuracy of inspections while decreasing overall time of a bag in the system.

QUESTIONS FROM CHAIRMAN MICHAEL T. MCCAUL FOR JEANNE M. OLIVIER

Question 1. What do you believe to be the primary takeaways from the innovation lanes in place at your airport?

Answer. The innovation lanes are a success in moving passengers faster through the screening queues and may reduce traveler frustration at delays from passengers who are unfamiliar with screening routines. The new lanes provide for several passengers to divest and load screening bins simultaneously, which means that the line is not held up by a single traveler. However, this benefit will only materialize as passengers become familiar with the new equipment and procedures. In other words, there is a learning curve. It appears that TSA staffing will still be required at the current levels for the checkpoints, but wait times may be reduced with improved throughput.

Question 2. What are the primary challenges to implementing new screening technologies at airports, such as automated screening lanes?

Answer. Funding for the lane equipment and space for the equipment will be key challenges for implementation of the new automated screening lanes, and funding would remain a primary challenge for implementing any other new screening technology. Another challenge has been passenger acceptance and behavior. Reconfiguration of the space and relocation of CCTV camera equipment etc. are additional considerations.

Question 3. Do you think that TSA's Innovation Task force is well-positioned to implement solutions from findings derived from the innovation lanes at your airport?

Answer. The innovation lanes are a successful effort at Newark Liberty International Airport. We understand that TSA has collected data on staffing, configuration, and threat resolution scenarios, however those data findings have not yet been shared with us as the airport operator.

Question 4. What are airports doing to support technology innovation at TSA and how do you perceive the relationship on this front between stakeholders and the agency?

Answer. We and other airports vigorously support TSA innovation and the TSA's Innovation Task Force, and believe TSA is on the right path in this regard. Some airports and airline tenant partners have already paid for pilots of technology innovation. A number of our colleague airports have volunteered to serve as pilot centers for TSA innovation efforts. We hope that airports will have an even greater role in the checkpoint improvements including those airports that lack financial resources to fund the efforts.

Question 5. What insight do you have into how TSA develops, procures, and deploys new technologies at airports? How can this process be made more effective?

Answer. We have very little insight into how TSA develops, procures, and deploys new technologies at airports. It is our impression that the Federal procurement process is very burdensome and thereby limits the TSA's agility and piloting of new technology.

Question 6. What solutions do you believe TSA should focus on in the medium- and long-term to usher in a new era of security screening at airports?

Answer. In the short run, the TSA PreCheck program helps speed passengers effectively through screening and is an important component of the checkpoint operation. It needs to be greatly expanded through private sector and industry enrollment options. In the longer term, technology enhancements that allow passengers to pass through the checkpoint without stopping, taking off shoes, removing laptops from bags, or carrying beverages and food while at the same time improving security and detection are important.

Question 7. Based on the experience of your airport, how well is TSA positioned as an agency to spur innovation at the checkpoint? What role and responsibility should stakeholders have in regards to such innovation?

Answer. We are encouraged by the formation of the Innovation Task Force. It is a step in the right direction. It needs to be sustained with permanent funding and adequate staffing. It needs to ensure an on-going vehicle for product and service providers to offer and demonstrate their innovative products and provide demonstration pilots for a wide breadth of such products.

The checkpoint and the screening of passengers and their baggage is and should be the sole responsibility of the TSA. That said, we recognize that airports and terminal operators, and airlines can and have volunteered to support innovation and adaptation to address specific facility needs or enhance the customer experience. It is critical that airports be involved early on in any TSA innovation plans. TSA, as with any Federal agency, is burdened by limited funding and very constrained procurement processes.

Question 8. Do you believe that the Innovation Task Force has been focusing on the aspects of security technology that are most in need of attention?

Are there other areas of the airport—such as checked baggage—where technology needs to be improved but has not been a focus of the ITF?

Answer. The Innovation Task Force is a small staff of 24 with no dedicated funding and therefore efforts that require longer continuity may be impeded. The Task Force addressed the "low-hanging fruit" of screening efficiency and passenger throughput through the introduction of new lanes. What will be far more challenging is the development and introduction of more effective screening equipment such as the CT machines for the checkpoint, and other methods of detection of harmful liquids, and artfully concealed explosives. Certainly there are many areas warranting improved technology for security beyond the checkpoints at our airports, including such things as effective CCTV tracking of individuals throughout a terminal, monitoring for gun shots, and further work regarding explosive detection in public spaces.